

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

BRAD AMOS)
)
v.) No. 3:21-0923
) Richardson/Holmes
THE LAMPO GROUP, LLC and)
DAVE RAMSEY)

O R D E R

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's unopposed motion to continue the trial date and for extension of time to complete discovery and file dispositive motions (Docket No. 86), which is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE because it includes both a request for a continuance of the trial, which is properly directed to the District Judge, and requests for extensions of case management deadlines, which, although properly directed to the Magistrate Judge, are deniable based on the current trial date.¹

If Plaintiff or the parties obtain a continuance of the trial date by a proper motion filed separately for the District Judge's attention, they may renew their motion for extensions of various case management deadlines. They are however cautioned that extension of case management deadlines is not automatic and any motion for extensions must detail the efforts to comply with original deadlines and the specific facts demonstrating good cause for modification of the deadline, per Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4) and the requirements of the initial case management order. (Docket No. 26 at para. M.) The parties are further cautioned that failure to proceed with discovery or treating discovery as stayed without a proper order of the Court may be at their own peril.

It is SO ORDERED.



BARBARA D. HOLMES
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The parties were previously warned that no further extensions of case management deadlines would be permitted because of the current trial date. (Docket No. 71 at 4.)